

CALLS SUFFRAGE ARGUMENT WEAK

Florence R. Hall Says Champions of Women's Votes Refuse to Accept Facts.

SEES PERIL TO COUNTRY

Pennsylvania Chairman Points to Alliance Between Suffragists and Socialists.

By MISS FLORENCE R. HALL.

(Chairman, Public Interest Committee, Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.)
Few of those who earnestly admit a belief in "votes for women" recognize the fact that they are indulging, perhaps without much thought, a movement which is a serious menace to our womanhood, our country, and the democratic principles upon which our whole system of government rests. Not the least of the evils that woman suffrage has brought in its train of agitation, is a degree of carelessness and intolerance in public discussion on a grave question, such as we hardly believe has been the case with any other issue presented for the decision of the people.

At the present moment, in countless columns of newspapers throughout the four 1915 campaign States—New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—persons of both sexes are debating woman suffrage with all the fervor shown by the war partisans. And a comparison of these columns will show that if anything the suffrage arguments are more limited, both in evidence and in tolerance, than the various war plans. At least, the suffrage debates seem almost exclusively on an academic, acrimonious, and indeed somewhat ancient plane.

Where Is the Evidence?

It would seem that with woman suffrage in eleven States, in several of which it has existed for one or two generations, there ought to be actual evidence available to guide the public in deciding this issue. One of the most significant admissions, however, in regard to this, is that of Dr. Anna Howard

Shaw, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, who says: "I contend that we should not answer our opponents on these lines. The results of equal suffrage, or the number of women who want suffrage, or the reasons why they ought to want it, have no bearing on our question." Consequently it is perhaps more due to design than accident that the suffragists are constantly indulging in the most ancient and academic pleas, among which are constantly reiterated the "right to vote," "taxation without representation is tyranny," which appear with astonishing regularity in speeches, letters and editorials of 1915 in spite of the fact that such Democrats and patriots as Thomas Jefferson and Richard Henry (Light Horse) Lee very ably answered these arguments before 1800. No one has ever so ably defined democracy as the author of the Declaration of Independence, which the suffragists, as early as 1848, paraded with a "Woman's Declaration of Independence." The "slavery" of women, the "tyranny" of men, the "oppression" of "man-made laws," and even the socialistic tendencies of suffrage were all expressed long before the civil war. Do not believe it? Then compare these "gems" from the founders with the next batch of arguments you hear for woman suffrage, in print or on platform.

"The prolonged slavery of woman in the darkest page of human history."
"The conditions of married women, under the law of all countries, has been essentially that of slaves."

"Woman's discontent increases in exact proportion to her development."
"The isolated household is responsible for a large share of woman's ignorance and degradation." (No wonder the Pennsylvania suffragists recently publicly hissed a State senator at Harrisburg for reverently mentioning "home" and "mother.") Had he used the terms "isolated household" and "slave" he would have gotten cheers, if the action of the suffragists at their national convention last November indicates anything. There, the man who told them that women were "slaves" and not even "people" in this country obtained an ovation.

Old Quotations Used.

Yes, all of these quotations are extremely old and still as new as the latest suffrage speech or editorial we have noticed. And yet they call it a "progressive" movement!

Naturally, the "antis" cannot be forever pointing out by quoting authorities the essential fallacy of regarding the ballot as a "natural right." The fact that the State in all cases fixes the terms upon which the franchise is granted,

within the limits proscribed by the Constitution, ought to be proof enough to anyone that he has no "natural right" to vote than he has to appoint himself a policeman or a soldier. In fact, according to the Constitution itself, a woman has an actual right to march around the city streets with a musket on her shoulder, under the terms of that instrument that establishes her citizenship, and state that "the rights of citizens to bear arms shall not be questioned."

But any attempt to exercise this "right to bear arms" would bring man or woman into prompt conflict with the police and judges. This "right" would be questioned and perhaps abolished by the first constable one met; and we hardly believe that anyone would take it to the Supreme Court, either. In other words, neither man nor woman has any "rights" in a community that conflict with the good of that community as a whole. The exercise of the ballot is limited and regulated by the State just as the "right" to bear arms. It is withheld from women for several very excellent reasons, which the experience of civilization, and the majority of women themselves, very generally endorse:

1. Because the average woman, the mother of children, is much less available for political duties than men, and must have more than "equal" rights and privileges in order to assume her much more than "equal" responsibilities in parenthood. Not only for a day, but often for weeks or months, the highest type and most essential mission of womanhood depends on rest, seclusion and protection such as no man can ever possibly need.

Ballot Represents Conflict.

2. Because the representation of the ballot, historically as well as politically, is the representation of the conflicting forces of physical and military strength. Nine men do not agree to obey an official elected by ten men because they realize the superior wisdom of the odd man—but because they realize his strength in the scale of possible conflict. On the other hand, would nine men admit the right of six men and four women to determine their laws and liberties? Quite possibly, in a club or organization from which anyone could withdraw at option, but if you extend this example to a nation, with the lives and safety of a whole people at stake, the problem may loom up like this:

The "balance of power" under a universal female franchise in this country might easily pass into the hands of the Socialists, the most persistent supporters and advocates of "votes for women." The powers conferred on our legislative and executive departments of government are tremendous, and might be abused by theorists putting pet social schemes on trial, just as injurious to the people as the rule of the "crims" and

political machines. Our present President is steering a course through as perilous rocks and bars as confronted Lincoln—and we are at peace with all the world. "Might have been" have little application, perhaps, but can anyone think of this nation's trouble today, in Mexico, if not in Europe, had the party that approved votes for women in its national platform in 1912 actually had the political assistance of a million or two headless woman suffragists, without grave consideration of this question from a country-wide viewpoint?

No one has a "right" to a vote that conflicts with the interests of this country as a whole. Plunging the sort of women into politics who are most eager to get there, and then asking all the women to check or cancel such votes, is an unnecessary creation of a burden on every woman because some women want the "rights" of men. This "right" recurs constantly, we believe, because the suffragists think it "pays to advertise" it, no matter how essentially false in principle. Woman's real rights, legally and socially, are those of protection and consideration for her sex, which she gets more uniformly the farther she remains away from politics.

Taxation and Representation.

Then, too, we often wonder why the "taxation" argument is presented so repeatedly when it was long since admitted by suffragists themselves to be out of date and fallacious. No one but the suffragists ever contended that "taxation" without a vote is tyranny, and corporations, estates, foreigners, and minors are taxed without the vote, just as much as women, because they derive an equal share of the governmental protection for which taxes are paid. Not one of our corporations can go into any foreign country and do business or own property without paying taxes of some sort and yet its claim to a right to vote for the officials of that government would be ludicrous.

Again, only one-eighth of the taxes are paid by women, and how can the men, who pay the seven-eighths, discriminate against the interests of the women without also raising their own taxes? Is not a taxpayer's chief concern the greatest property protection for the least possible tax cost? And when you consider that Pennsylvania is the only State in the Union out of debt, although its property is most excellently protected, and then compare it with conditions in Colorado, where woman suffrage has brought the highest per capita tax in the country, and where Federal soldiers had to be imported, at additional expense to the taxpayers, to replace an inefficient State administration elected by "votes for women"—what do the interests of the women-owning women lie?

Does she pay taxes for cheap, efficient protection of her life and property, or for a costly and careless government,

which she must supplement, for her own protection, by paying additional taxes to bring in outside military help to maintain law and order?

Law and Order Question.

And the question of law and order is deep-rooted in this issue. Why, do you believe, is "every Socialist a suffragist," why was the "Men's League for Woman Suffrage" founded by Socialists? Why does the historian of the suffrage movement so heartily approve the aid being given the "cause" by Socialists; and why does Dr. Shaw herself "welcome every Socialist vote?"

There is a reason and a similarity between these two agitations that should direct men's and women's thoughts to their friendly alliance, and inquire whether it bodes good or ill to this country. Note and compare the fierce indictments of the men, the laws, and conditions by the suffragists with the same attacks made by Socialists. And then think of the basic principles, given above, on which this agitation was founded: "Discontent" regarded as portend to development, and the "isolated household"—which Christians call home, indicted as a cause of "woman's ignorance and degradation."

HOROSCOPE.

"The stars incline, but do not compel."

Sunday, March 28, 1915.

This is rather a fortunate day, according to astrology. Saturn, Uranus and Venus are all in benefic aspect. Travel is subject to good influences. Journeys begun today should be safe. Obstacles will be encountered, but they will be overcome.

The sign is auspicious for love affairs, especially for romances in which persons past youth are concerned. Marriages among middle aged and old persons will increase in number.

This should be a lucky day for plans relating to mining or underground operations of any sort. The stars indicate the discovery of new gold fields, and much excitement and speculation.

Next day is in a place denoting scandals among persons who wield power. Army and navy circles will be affected, but the chief revelation will relate to the administrations of large charities and benefactions of all kinds.

A nation wide agitation is probable. The planets foreshadow starvation affecting thousands of persons. These conditions will be so widespread in

Low-Necked Dress Safe; Don't Figures Prove It?

Washington Health Officer Cites Statistics Showing Pneumonia More Fatal to Men Than to Women.

Health Officer Woodward yesterday

made public statistics showing that Washington girls may continue wearing those pretty low-necked dresses which expose a wide V-shaped expanse of neck and bosom. The statistics refuted the popular belief that Washington girls are dying from pneumonia and influenza by baring their necks to the caress of chill winds.

Dr. Martin Friedrich, chief of the bureau of communicable diseases in Cleveland, recently issued a statement in which he warned Cleveland girls against the low-neck dress. He analyzed death statistics and found that the low-neck and thin dresses caused many deaths from pneumonia and influenza among Cleveland girls.

Dr. Friedrich agrees with the girls that low necks are healthful, but he adds, "in some climates." He declares that Cleveland and other cities with changeable weather should bar the low neck. Dr. Woodward says that while Washington may have weather that is very frigid, the death rate from pneumonia

here among women is smaller than among men.

"Consider the figures," says Dr. Woodward. "In 1912 thirty-four males and only twenty-two females between the ages of 10 and 20 years died from pneumonia. In 1913 twenty-three males and twenty-four females died. Last year pneumonia caused the deaths of nineteen males and twenty-one females."

"We see that in the last three years seventy-six men and boys and sixty-seven girls and young women have died in this city of pneumonia. These figures would seem to show that the men wore low-necked shirts and the girls wore the high starched collars. It would be impossible for me to say how many, if any, of the girls and women who died from pneumonia lost their lives through wearing low-necked dresses."

"The death rate from pneumonia is really much higher among men than among women, for the police census of 1912 shows that of the population of 52,598 in the District, 18,430 were females and 34,168 were males, nearly 18,000 more females than males."

WON'T TALK, BUT WILL READ.

Kitchener Prefers to Keep to Himself What He Knows of War.

Special Cable to The Washington Herald.
London, March 27.—Lord Kitchener's reticence about the military secrets of the war is proverbial. A civilian friend, however, was bent on extracting from the silent war minister a confidential opinion about the recent developments of the campaign. Accordingly he invited Lord Kitchener to dine with him informally one evening. But throughout the meal he could not make up his mind to tackle his guest directly on the point, and all indirect suggestions failed. After dinner the host escorted Lord Kitchener back to the war office. There, mustering his courage, he decided to take the bull by the horns, and turning to the war minister, boldly inquired:

"Well, what's the latest about the war?"

"Let's get an evening paper and see," replied Kitchener.

(Copyright, 1915.)

A MAN ISN'T ALWAYS CRAZY IF HE LAUGHS TO HIMSELF.—By Goldberg.

Copyright, 1915, by R. L. Goldberg.



A MAN WHO IS SEEN LAUGHING TO HIMSELF ALWAYS ATTRACTS A LOT OF UNFAVORABLE ATTENTION—PERHAPS HE IS ONLY CASHING IN THE LAUGHS HE WAS TOO POLITE TO TAKE

IT'S ALL WRONG, PADEREWSKI, IT'S ALL WRONG.—By Goldberg.

Copyright, 1915, by R. L. Goldberg.

